12/20/71

Dear Paul (JHS),

Glad to get your 12/14 and all the enclosed (good)goodies. I also am under serious times pressures and may ignore whatbrequires no comment or that on which I can't make any of worth.

Glad to see the nature of your musical interest. I had come to the reluctant conclusion that your generation is interested in only two things: decibels and tonal crap (to me, that is). I had heard that you tootled, but no more. Despite what you see, I'm longhair, in even jazz. I would, however, hope that your comment, "This is what I do in real life" means only part of what you do in the other life!

Perhaps the pysics pressure is a good thing. You'll get that cleaned up and it will be off your back. You'll be free for career and writing. Without pressures we sometimes don't do what we should (as, for example, Gary right now, who should be getting his over with). I don't think I'll be able to do much about telling you more about the trip now, and I've forgotten what I did write. Our suit for the ruin of our farm now requires considerable time and attention, and I must try and finish PM while what I have on paper is at least in part still in mind. I think you should, if it is at all possible, come here before you start to write or after you get your outline done and whatever samples you plan on paper. If I didn't say, and I've said to very few, considering what happens when we say even "boo", Kaack has been fired, I don't know why, and he confirms the pre-arrest visits to the Garners, when LHO was not there. I think this is significant.

Jim said little to me about his unshirting of Sprague. But it accomplished nothing. MF was my source. She was there. I saw Berkeley's and I've beensent but haven't read Vince's. I have Harrison's formulation: the CIA is now good guys bevause of what is not in the Pentagon Papers. They are still close, very close.... The Wecht letter to CTIA seems to have been inSM's inspiration (she did not tell me, JP did). You reflect what JP told me. However, Smith had begun an intensive study of the medical evidence in preparation for a planned CTIA role, of which I learned only by accident...I asked about a cassette recorder so that, if I don't get them transcribed, I can lend you some of my Dallas notes, which I have that way. MF has them also and may trabscribe. Some are confidential. I think I listed who spoke to me and what I learned of the real root of what is attributed to Hudkins. In strictest confidence, his source was Houston FBI, not Sweatt or Alexander (who, independently, has exactly this suspicion, according to Henry Wade).

I've not read Navasky, but I was sent a stat of p.65 and used it in a note I've sent GRS, asking afterward that he send it to you so you may suggest anything else relevant in that book. At this point it mentions only Jack Miller among those who in any way figured in the investigation, not by WC, as you say, but by having been sent to Dallas.

You may be right in thinking you should get stuff on paper before you travel. Your reasoning is sound. You might start closer to home, with Guthman, who was supposed to see me but didn't. He is at LATimes, or was when I last heard...I have the explosive bullets stuff (and it is that) from Smith, and I've made a few suggestions. I also knew about Mae, from her, when it was about to happen. If she's still on, that's something.

Your 11/7 to Smith: I also recommended against retractions. Your second graph is inadequate. When you write of this, if you do, remember COUP. More than San Antonio. And the FBI was more than aware of the Miami tape. Miami gave them a dub. Probably transcript, too. If the clerk saw anything, it had to be one of these things. Remember "The Dick Rubbers", too. If there is a statement from the clerk, I've not heard of it. I know of Mark's....Your ref to SM/Belin: If you don't have the crap he did for the NYTimes, I have a dupe...Similas: there is more than I had in PW now. I turned everything I had over to a Canadian who has copped out but did carry further. ...Sprague: as usual, he has nothing of his own so he garbles the work of others. The proofs of the second and unpublished piece were turned over. It

was said to include pix. My copy of the proofs doesn't have pix, but that is not unusual, pix being half-times, different kinds of cuts, different screen, if the mag was printed by offset.

On your 11/4 clipping list, the only things that might interest (and you can tell better than I if they have any substance) are the T-P for the 7, both items. (Schweiman is farright but was behind JG). 12/8 list: I didn't know Abel had died. Is the Chron 26 p44 on FCL worth anything? I don't remember them or author, de la Torrente. 27 on "US cna now charge Garrison" doesn't make sense. They always could. They elected to delay. T-P 6:2-7, Heebe-Shaw. When you copy anythong, I'd like to have for record. JG off his rocker here again. I heard the S-I had a double banner saying the federal government blocked jim. He should have quit on that note. When you are here, remind me to tell you about Heebe and Shaw. I don't have 11 story on JG suit, but he told me it is negligence and hospital staph, which they held from him and his family. 22:10, Long, I'd like to have as matternof record. Rather Russell. He didn't go this far with me. Not, it is Long with "l". 30: any significance in Inca speakers' names other than Butler?

Your 11/28 on CIA correspondence: Bud did see that picture. I know when. I think that had it meant anything, he'd not, and they wouldn't offer to show you. I also thought, beginning when I heard that Bud was going to see, that they will have a new but meaningless policy in which they'll show the meaningless. Agree your interpretation they will not under law. They'll take position they are exempt laws provisions because of their function. It is also possible they may want to engage you in conversation about other matters, to see what you might know. I think they are now a bit more sensitive to their p.r. And enough time has passed so they are not seriously worried about such things as JG's mouthings. Besides, he and Salandria now think the CIA is good guys. JG told me. Your (3) on Mex. City bug may account for speed. By the way, I expect a reporter friend from there soon. If there is anything worth the trouble we'd like to know, let me know pronto. This one is world's expert on Kaplan-Vidal(less?). Good contacts in press there, too....I was not able to carry inquiry into current Dallas CIA interest farthur when there. No time. Maybe they took note of my frequent (including recent)saying Helms didn't do or order.

On restricting: they have a better case in general than even FBI, I think. We'd best be on very solid ground before filing anything in court.

You might, in further corres., quote Liebeler from Epstein on this picture. How they goofed is the mystery. I think they are not likely lying. Their comments on your 3&4 probably legitimate, can classify to protect sources. Your 11/14: very good. Press for answer to your question, how it came to be associated with LHO. They don't have to answer under FOI, but press anyway and let them claim this. They know they have a file that accounts for that blooper, and they know it can be classified, but let them tell you that. Good close. I'd use this, esp. amplified, for anything of seeming value we want. Appeal to their sense of p.r. now that Hoover is getting what for.

Your series with the Archives, 12/14,11/10, 11/30, excellent, I have to stop here for a while.

I will go over the other material separately and then be in touch with you and JHS. I note here, in ref. to your comment on Riesel, that unless my recollection is in error he does not read, except, perhaps, braille, having been blinded by afd. I suppose the ever-thoughtful St. Edgar does what he can to help overcome this handicap.

You have missed a point I have raised but never pushed with the Archives. You have the AG's memo on the FOI. I had been waiting until I would be able to carry through in court. If you will read the first full paragraph on p.24 you'll find the answer: Rhoads has to forward your request to the other agency. If he refuses, file suit. If Kleindienst does, ditto. I'd file against both, without telling them the basis, and then spring this on them in court. It should be an automatic victory.

They have, indeed, been adding reasons for withholding. They are apparently deter-

mined to withhold some things, come hell or high...so they are redundant. I'm not rereading the law to see the applicability of some, but it seems they site provisions I don't recall. I am awaiting answers to my questions, what laws were being enforced? I've also appealed some of these, as on the exsess. Think I sent you copies. Intended to. ...They like the phrase details of a personal nature, and they interpret, as they have with mein the identical words, what has a significant connection with the assassination. "Personal" is not the language of the exemption, and I know the last part is not in the law. ...why not ask for a copy of the executive order "specifically" requiring these things, and ask them to provide a second copy with the specific requirement underline. It would be effective for use in court. There is no such. This, again, is interpretation. His, I think. 9: I think that if this ever applied, it was waived under American Mail by practise. 10 is entirely different than they gave me in 1966 when I was turned down. I even offered from them to edit everything but her account of the injuries. Pretty farout. It was originally done by the Commission. If you don't want to push on this one separately, I'll be glad to pick up with my original request and file an appeal, without asking Rhoads again. I suspect I have much that fits with it in PM and stuff I've not yet written. 11 indicates that after my correspondence, of which you have copies, they realized they have no case and started adding new provisions. Their last paragraph is also wild. W's letter can bestow no rights not in the exemptions of the law and it can remove none we have under that law....I didn t know you also were going after this ex. sess. Do you think we both should?

In your 11/30 you put the law-enforcement part well....On Ex Order 10501 go over some of the correspondence I've sent you. I think it has no standing....On relevance, I'd also argue that they are not empowered to decide for a researcher what he considers relevant to his work. They are not doing the research, we are....Your point on the Kaufman letter, the same one I used, is well put. But not enough. It is not a provision of any exemption of the law.

I have started a separate file of your FPI requests, so I've separated the Arch corres. from your memo of 12/14. I have separated the 11/1-11/30 exchange with the A and the 11/24-12/1 with HISC from the Roddenbury stuff in CDs 171,177. You had them stapled. The letters will also be in your FOI file here.

I think you may have a very good point in those missing fellow-Marines statements. The marines knew best who of his outfit to ask, hence the WC omitted? Did have or want?

I'll go over the CDs separately. Thanks,

And appropriate greetings,